LiLI Steering Committee and SPLAT Meeting
August 21, 2008
8:30am – 2:30pm

Meeting Record

Participants:

Kay Flowers, Idaho State University

Lynn Baird, University of Idaho

Jane Somerville, Stanley Community Library

Julie Woodford, Burley Public Library

Glynda Pflieger, Melba Middle/High School

Dylan Baker, Ada Community Library

Memo Cordova, Boise State University

Heather Redding, Eastern Idaho Technical College

Ruth Funabiki, University of Idaho Law

Sue Niewenhous, Lewis Clark State College

Marilyn Moody, Boise State University

Mary DeWalt, Ada Community Library

Cindy Erickson, Soda Springs Public Library

Stephen Poppino, College of Southern Idaho

Anna Warns, Ada Community Library

Tamra Hawley House, Boise Public Library

Amy Vecchione, Idaho State Historical Society

ICFL Staff:

| Gina Persichini | Marj Hooper | Stephanie Bailey-White |
| Frank Nelson | Erin McCusker | Charlotte Fowles |

Facilitator: Jennifer Hall

Recorders: Nancy Reese and Tamara Tipton

Future of the ILS Conference – Debrief of Common Themes

- Conferences reinforce what's important (customer service, etc). They show how pieces come together and what kind of service you get.
- We want it all, but concerned we would ever achieve this.
- Want more control, but losing it.
- If we didn't have the integrated library system, we'd need more people. We need these not to be the centerpiece.
- Customer service & ILS: how all the pieces come together
- "silo" new terminology – need to work together as a system
- Shopping analogy – department store – people want to "check out" one time, not buy something in one department, go to another department and buy something else. Why can't you get all of your resources in one place on a database? Why go to difference sources for different information?
- Outreach and engagement with the community is most important.
- Technical people get excited about what is possible, but can we actually do that?
  How can Idaho by itself accomplish ILS leadership? We are a small state.
- Because of the conference, I was able to take more informed questions back to the vendor and give them a better idea of what we really want.
- Would like to have some ideas from vendors about what is coming down the pipe and what they are planning.
- Decoupling back office from the discovery tools. One vendor got the message! The vendors are trying to differentiate themselves, so the invention of silos is in use by the vendors to make

themselves more attractive to the buyers. They hope to make money by selling new products that precede the existing databases that the buyers keep for long periods of time.

- Integrate libraries into the real world – we don't need to be separated from the daily lives of people.
- Part of a team that brings all types of media together. All are merged by their model. Only certain people have access to the list.
- When dealing with at least two vendors, they want their database to be the main, they don't want integrated. They'd like to be the main thing the user sees. Everyone wants their branding up front.
- In order to make money, the end user isn't going to follow that, because they want the ease of access. The vendors know they have a captive audience. Scholarly content has a lock on "captive content".
- Access for people who want good content. We need a way from the vendor to give the middle man the access they want.
- The websites that are making access easy are the ones who have good content, and the ad revenue helps pay for the database.
- People are going to their business journal in Google scholar. It's not just the undergrads, it's the faculty. If a faculty member needs an article, they are going to the author in order to get what they need because it's easiest.
- The quality of content is one thing, but it is not easy to get to. With the federated search, if we're giving up features and the power search, it doesn't matter so long as it is easy to get the best information and gets the job done.
- A lot of researchers get their applications turned down because adequate research is not being done. Research needs to go back to the 50s or before, even if some is out of date, some of the older material is still quite relevant.
- Older material is not available in the open web.
- How are people getting what they need? Using the best way for that moment? At a vendor demo, there was an example of digging down in an advanced search. Inspired by the big picture, and determining what can be taken from the conference that can be used on a daily basis.
- Trying to find agreement between those offering, the users, and the vendors of the databases. We need to step back and think of policies and procedures that have to be agreed on and worked with.
- Do focus groups help with showing what is being used?
- This goes beyond just the libraries cooperating. It's also dealing with the external elements (city, county, state governments). How is this going to be pulled off if you can't get everyone to agree?
- Libraries are controlled – can't necessarily give patrons *everything* they want? Is there something we can do to start working on that within management before it gets taken to the governance level?
- We all do circulation – but what does that mean? We provide services. There is uniqueness among branches. Does geography determine what the libraries need? Community make-ups vary and libraries must tailor to the different needs of their particular patrons.
- Statistics is also system generated, and some of the information should and could come from our libraries if we could determine how to count things. We must use our accumulators. Management information needs to be thought of as well.

- We are trying to provide seamless service to the patrons.
- The people getting things done are the ones who are building relationships with their vendor or if they have a bitter account with their vendor.
- Librarians want to provide the services, they want to give. But our society is not that way – it is capitalist, and does not necessarily want to give to everyone.
- The big accounts can affect development, but this is not necessarily a good thing. If a big system was developed for Harvard, what works for them may not work for everyone.
  Every library's needs are different.
- If change isn't the issue, and lack of money is, where does that leave the whole library community? Depending on the kindness of strangers?
- We need to disassociate ourselves from the vendors – they are looking for money. Vendors are not going to change unless it is in their best interest. Who has the means to create and ILS system?
- We need high level personnel to make the system work adequately. It's tough to support open source when you don't have the money to back it up.
- Mellon open library environment. There is not a market for this development.
- With open source, the up-front cost is not the issue; the issue is in maintaining it. That eats away at your budget.
- The biggest obstacle to change is not money – this will always be a problem.
- The grant application process is a way to ease the process, but it is always hard to find the money you need when you need it without applying again and again.

What can be done to help libraries be ready for what is coming next? How can we prepare for the future? Do we need to build a different foundation? Strengthen current one?

- There are many things happening already – LiLI-U helps with database cleanups and fixes. We're doing what we can to get our data ready. This leaves our options open.
- We need to facilitate a paradigm shift among library staff. Change happens, and should not be feared. People need to think about this from the user side, and get used to thinking ahead, and this may help us prepare for the future. Splat assists with this.
- We need to become realists. There are 20-25 Idaho libraries that are still not automated. Maybe we need to go backwards and push everyone to a certain level. Move the baseline up.
  Some libraries say it is not in their interest to be automated. How much of the budget will automation eat up? Some is attitude, some is economics. Some say that bottom line, it is not worth it to them or their patrons. There is a lot of work to be done, but it would be great if we could get the smaller libraries all up to the same place.
- Wyoming is all at the same level throughout the state. It was a push to ensure that everyone in the state had access.
- Some libraries are so small they have to choose between automation and buying books.
  What can we do to give them the opportunity to do these things? To offer these programs and services? What can we do to all meet and offer some of the same things?
- The upcoming generation needs to be aware, and educated on the fact that a lot of work went into the building of these systems. Seamless is invisible, so a lot of this isn't really thought of. We need to come up with a better way to share all of these systems. A lot of this deals with policies.

- A lot of people keep systems 10-20 years. Maybe we need to start now and work toward a state system, even if we are this far out – even if it doesn't happen for 5 more years. This takes a lot of prep time. When we get to the point, we need to have the prep work done.
  If we could do what we are suggesting, we need to have a statewide system, with everything as one source.
- Offering complete access to every Idaho citizen, all interests. Maybe sell as open access – democracy – get state money to fund.
- What if everyone actually agrees? We could accomplish something like this a lot more quickly than 5 years from now. Why can't we just do this? It can be done. People might worry about current state, but we can work with this.
- We are counting the wrong things, and cataloging wrong things. Maybe catalog the community!
- Celebrate the uniqueness of each community, but get them to see beyond their local borders. Share it with others. The LiLI databases help with accomplishing this.
  We need to think outside of our local borders and build a statewide community.
  You can retain identity with your branches by the services offered to the community.
- The main point of interest is digital services offered. This is in beginning stages. There are different people with different connections to information.
- There needs to be cooperation between the libraries.

If we "take off our practical glasses" and remove the tools from the conversation, what does library service look like in the future?

- When we step away from the trinkets we use or how we get info to patrons. The system is a service provided. A lot of the things we are seeing now that we are using may be obsolete in the next 10-15 years.
- Delivery of our service is what matters.
- There are different skill levels; we have to be able to adapt.
- The future is in the relationships we are building with our communities. We try to give information to many people. Maybe the best way to get across what we know is to network with people. We need to promote.
- Get out to the community – identify your movers and shakers and get to know them.
  W e need to knock down our walls. We will always have books – but there is so much more that is offered that people that will never know. We need to make sure people know all the library has to offer.
- People love the idea of being able to go to different libraries (LiLI Express). If you choose to extend additional services, you need to back it up. Have any lost records been done? Not at this time. There are no negative comments on lost materials.
- There is potential to end up with a situation with no accountability. Maybe libraries on the LiLI express networks issue cards to users who are borrowing from that particular library.
- There is a need for small communities, school libraries to have access to these materials. We need to break the cycle that people are moving away for better resources.
  These communities are not going to grow. We need to share the resources that we have.
  Without the databases, like LiLI-D, some small school libraries would be extremely cut off.
- Everyone in the state should have equal access to give everyone a chance to succeed in every community.

- Something that we do is proctor tests. Libraries are involved in a lot of time-consuming activities.
- There is so much being done online, but if you want to get paid, you will have to do a great many things. Some are thinking of hiring extra staff to take responsibilities for the extra things. With services of the future, you need to be able to adapt and change.
- How do you create the environment that people are interested in making these changes? What are the costs? Staying the same – what's the threat? Staying here has to be worse than going forward—engage people in the future of libraries.
- Some are more optimistic about change than others.
- Some responses for not liking/ not changing are psychological? What about the ones just waiting to retire, those not interested in other aspects?
- Libraries are incredibly responsive to their customers. Those reluctant to change are not the norm. Libraries are incredibly important to their communities. Those that push people to grow and try to make things better are not the ones who are reluctant to change.
- There are some that don't focus on the ILS, they use the web, LiLI, services they need to connect. The use of resources – using people, what you know and what's at hand. Research.
- Libraries doing resource sharing for the first time are more open to change and alternate methods – such as deliver straight to the patron's home. Eliminate the middle man. Because some of these tools have not been available to the libraries puts them light years ahead.
- How do you get these libraries out? When are resources a means to an end?
  The ultimate thing for some has been these resources – full text, etc.
  Look at ILS and resources as being tools to make the communities better.
- What is it the community really wants from us? What is it what the users really want?
  Figure out what you can do for patrons. They may be happy with even the simplest solution. Some libraries are offering terrible customer service. Even when some requests are so simple, why can't it be solved on an equally simple level?
- Faculty care about content; student needs are different. Students want service. What is it that your users want?
- You must come out of the bubble and get staff trained on customer service that is specific to libraries. We want patrons to feel safe. In the training, a possible education model could be stations.
- Incorporate customer service into everything; all training.
- Splat is working on a statewide model of the "23 things".
- We want people to become familiar with Web 2.0. Staff interaction is improving among themselves and each other with this training.
- We are trying to connect with the user. Whatever the issues are – how do you get to the point of listening to and identifying with particular patron's issues? We are always struggling on how to do a better job communicating.
- We need to see beyond the tools. A person with a laptop isn't just tied to the technology, they are communicating.
- Learn from patrons. Learn from those using things that people are using that are working for them. The point of need is the teachable moment.

What can Libraries Linking Idaho do to help the library community prepare for an uncertain future?

- How can we teach people to be comfortable with the unknown? How do we teach adaptability?
- If you understand the system of why things work the way they do, it is easier to understand the procedures, and why things happen the way they do. How do we get over the system running in the background? Mental models – the conceptual idea.
- Personal experience makes a difference in how we learn and community with our customers.
- What is it we really want libraries and their staff to do? What is the level? What is a mental model for change?
- Recording the classics for the Talking Book service would be a great way to use Project Guttenberg. (Since these are in the public domain).
- Some libraries know their communities, but not the demographics. Looking for a less expensive way to collect this data. The people not going to the library may benefit from some of the services offered – such as digital book downloading. There may be resources at the local levels for finding this information. A lot of county governments have access to this software. It is going to take commitment to collect this information. Frank has 3 hours on the ILA agenda to take the data from library statistics for presentation. Access to ILS data – not getting personal, but would like to know what people are actually using, what they like, what they want. Even 15% of the population is a huge number of people to work with.
- Are there some shortcuts we can take to help with the resources?
- Missing with the statewide catalog – what will users get out of a statewide catalog? Is there a report that can be made? We need to get the users to say what they want. (Meaning sales pitch)…get the users what they want, no matter where they are in the state.
  When talking to the users, ask them what they want. How can the library help their patrons live their lives better?
- If we can customize for various patrons needs. Focus groups can be very helpful in showing the needs and wants of the users. A lot of ideas and programs can stem from these reports. Finding common ground between libraries – patrons are Idaho citizens. We have more in common than we think. Relationships are based on similarities - focus groups are helpful to change thinking.

Looking more practically, what will help the library community in the future?

- Advertising eaudiobooks (how libraries are using them) – share success stories like those that listen on their tractors
- Address bandwidth issues that affect database usage
- Address infrastructure issues – clean up of records in local databases & WorldCat
- Barcodes – libraries need to prepare now so they don't have to re-barcode in the future if there is a statewide shared system
- Look at accountability in reciprocal borrowing for non-resident users
- LiLI as an equalizer: leverage library as a group to get more
- Customer service training as part of new technology training (combine with clips of the digital natives)
- Show examples of how libraries have addressed issues successfully

- Identify customers in our community – use clips/advertising video
- Statewide video contest – could be generational as a way to collect stories (good to use during National Library Week) – have ads at the senior center
- Ask users want what they want—even if it is not fun to us (maybe all they want is someone to walk to the book over to their office and not a fancy new system)
- Useful data collection (and access to it) to identify our communities better
- Can we agree on a base of resources based on Idaho residency versus local library service area?
- Expand target and scope of LiLI-D to include more for the professional community
- More marketing of LiLI services
- Consistency of LiLI-D – changes are hard to manage
- Continue with statewide digitization efforts to get unique collections available to Idahoans
- Get out of the library to market services
- Identify our needs to vendors in regard to federated searching and search results combined in OPAC
- Consider a statewide 5-year plan for a statewide system – coordinate big-picture ideas/vision
- Aim for a statewide "something"
- Ask the user what they want – more focus groups (build on the success of the digital native focus groups)
- Set up a fund to use to purchase books that have wide-range appeal – available statewide

Next steps:

- Gina will send out meeting record to SPLAT and LiLI Steering Committee. After initial review, notes will be shared with Idaho library community via ICFL website
- Gina will send a request (via Doodle) to schedule the next LiLI Steering Committee meeting.
- Next meeting agenda items to include:
  - LiLI Work Plan – continued discussion of future direction
  - Update on LiLI Database contracts/renewals
  - Update on LiLI Unlimited participation and next steps